

condemnation of 24 packages (18 single packages and 6 special packages) of Madam Dean Female Pills, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Milwaukee, Wis., alleging that the article had been shipped by Martin Rudy, Lancaster, Pa., on or about August 10, 1918, and transported from the State of Pennsylvania into the State of Wisconsin, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part: (Package) "Female Pills * * * give relief in female disorders of the menstrual functions * * * for painful irregular scanty menstruation;" (booklet) "* * * irregular, prolonged, or suppressed menstruation * * * a remedy intended solely for the relief of amenorrhoea, dysmenorrhoea, * * * and other derangements of the reproductive system * * * especially valuable in the functional changes * * * of the menopause or change of life * * * act on the circulatory system of the uterus, * * * assist in reestablishing or restoring the menstrual or monthly period * * * strengthen and build up the uterine function * * * a great relief against those general complaints the female sex is subject to. They help increase the vital quality of the blood, assist to bring nature into its proper channel * * * to assist nature with * * * disorders * * * during the change of life period * * * continue the treatment until they give relief * * * great relief from pains or headache * * * for suppressed menstruation * * * continue their use until relieved * * * take until the menstrual flow commences again."

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the "single" pills consisted essentially of aloes, quinine, ferrous sulphate, hydrastis, ginger, and cornstarch, and that the "special" pills consisted essentially of aloes, quinine, ferrous sulphate, senecio flowers and herb, ginger, and cornstarch.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that the labels upon the packages and accompanying circular bore certain statements, as aforesaid, which were false and fraudulent in that the article contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the curative or therapeutic effects claimed for it.

On October 6, 1920, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

SC79. Misbranding of Leonard Ear Oil. U. S. * * * v. 11 Dozen Bottles of Leonard Ear Oil. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Destruction ordered by the court. (F. & D. No. 11326. I. S. No. 3031-r. S. No. W-502.)

On or about September 30, 1919, the United States attorney for the Western District of Washington, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 11 dozen bottles of Leonard Ear Oil, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Seattle, Wash., alleging that the article had been shipped by A. O. Leonard, New York, N. Y., July 21, 1919, and transported from the State of New York into the State of Washington, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part: (Carton) "* * * recommended for relief of Deafness, Head Noises, Discharging, Itching, Scaly Ears * * * and Ear Ache * * * Ear Troubles * * *;" (bottle) "* * * for relief of deafness * * * Dry, Itching, Aching and Discharging Ears * * *;" (circular) "* * * has

relieved the Deafness and Head Noises of more people than any known remedy
 * * * to soften and loosen the mucus * * *."

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted of a solution of camphor, oil of eucalyptus, and a trace of alkaloid in mineral oil.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that certain statements regarding its curative and therapeutic effect, appearing on the labeling thereof, were false and fraudulent as the article contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the effects claimed.

On January 29, 1920, the said A. O. Leonard, claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel and confessed judgment, a decree was entered by order of the court for the destruction of the product by the United States marshal.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

8680. Misbranding of Zendejas Treatment. U. S. * * * v. 89 Bottles of a Drug Product. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released on bond. (F. & D. No. 12437. I. S. No. 9701-r. S. No. C-1930.)

On May 3, 1920, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Texas, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 89 bottles of a drug product, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Houston, Tex., alleging that the article had been shipped by Panfilo Zendejas, Los Angeles, Calif., on or about February 13, 1920, and transported from the State of California into the State of Texas, and charging misbranding under the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part, "Zendejas Treatment a Strong Purifier of the Blood a Blood Depurator."

Analysis of a sample of the product by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of an aqueous solution containing potassium iodid, plant extractives, and water.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that the above-quoted statements regarding the curative or therapeutic effects of the said drug product or medicine were false and fraudulent in that the medicine contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the curative or therapeutic effects claimed for it.

On September 27, 1920, Panfilo Zendejas, claimant, having filed an answer and consented to a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to said claimant upon the payment of the costs of the proceeding and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$100, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

8681. Adulteration of canned salmon. U. S. * * * v. 208 Cases of Canned Salmon. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 12438. I. S. No. 664-r. S. No. E-2092.)

On May 6, 1920, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 208 cases of canned salmon, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at New York, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about July 10, 1919, and transported from the State of Virginia into the State of New York, and charging adulteration under the Food and Drugs Act.